PARALLEL CLAUSES
BETWEEN THIRD AND SECOND ISAIAH
| a new kind of computer-concordance[1]

Archibald L.H.M. van Wieringen — Nijmegen

Introduction

Biblical exegetes are interested in relationships between texts. Whatever the interpretation of the intertextual relationships may be — synchronic or diachronic, literary or historical —, the basis of the interpretation has always to consist of "hard facts", i.e. of checkable formal observations *in* the text itself. The classical aid to make these observations, especially for biblical texts, is the use of concordances.

This interest in intertextual relationships applies to exegetes who are involved in Third Isaiah, particularly as to texts from Second Isaiah.[2] A systematical investigation is necessary for a good description of the literary relationships between Second and Third Isaiah. Only a few complete surveys exist, which are considered, because of their lexical orientation, as traditional concordances based on single lemmata.[3] A study of the relationships between two textblocks, only based on lexical aspects, is not sufficiently precise to describe and exegize the intertextual connections.

In this article, I would like to present a method for the search of intertextual relationships with more criteria than the lexical one. Furthermore, I wish to make a comparison between my method and one-sided search-procedures. Finally, I will

---

[2] This interest exists since B. DUHM's commentary on Isaiah from 1892. DUHM regarded the 'quotations' of words and expressions from Second Isaiah in Third Isaiah as a proof of his view that Third Isaiah is an epigone of Second Isaiah.

[3] A. ZILLESSEN, "Tritojesaja" und Deuterojesaja. Eine literarkritische Untersuchung zu Jes 56-66, *ZAW* 26 (1906) 231-276; H. ODEBERG, *Trito-Isaiah. A Literary and Linguistic Analysis*, Uppsala 1931; K. ELLIGER, *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja*, Stuttgart 1933; W. ZIMMERLI, Zur Sprache Tritojesajas, *SThU* 20 (1950) 110-122; A. MURTONEN, Third Isaiah — Yes or No?, *Abr-n.* 19 (1980/81) 20-42.

make some evaluative remarks.

1. The computer assisted analysis resulting in *analogies*

In my view, gaining an insight into the literary relationships between two textblocks requires more information than only separate lemmata. Isolated lemmata do not give meaning to a text. For that purpose, lemmata have to be analysed *within* syntactical observations.[4]

Therefore I have executed a comparison between two textblocks on the level of the *clause*. If two clauses (from each textblock one clause) have sufficient lexical and morpho-syntactical parallelities, I consider them as a pair of parallel clauses, for which I use the term *analogy*. With the aid of a computer these parallelities are calculated.

The basis of the computer aided analysis is the data-base which has been developed by the *Werkgroep Informatica* (Working-group Computer Science) of the *Vrije Universiteit* (Free University) in Amsterdam. This data-base contains the Biblical Hebrew text with a grammatical code. This code is constructed hierarchically ascending from lexemes and morphemes to phrases and clauses.

I consider an analogy as a pair of parallel clauses. A clause is understood as a connected series of phrases to which one predicate is attributed. Consequently, I have chosen for a primarily phrase-orientated search-procedure within the clause.

This search-procedure consists of a comparison of the phrases. The assessment on which grounds of which it is decided to call a pair of clauses an analogy, takes place in six stages. I sum up these six stages in short.[5]

In the first round of the analysis the phrases of the two *entire* clauses are compared. Two questions are posed here, firstly, do the clauses have the same phrases? and, secondly, do the identical phrases appear in the same order of sequence? In this way, a syntactical framework is created for the next five stages of the analysis.

The second round of analysis calculates the percentage of lexically identical lexemes in the two *entire* clauses. This means that the first two stages of the analysis work with the total length of the clauses involved in the (possible) analogy.

The third round of the analysis deals with lexemes of the same word-type. The question that is posed here is: to what extent do two lexemes have the same morphological characteristics and grammatical word-functions? The value of this question in the analysis is that possibly lexically different lexemes can be compared.

---

[4] See: E. TALSTRA, Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible. II: Syntax and Semantics, *BiOr* 30 (1982) c. 35-36.

[5] Confer also: A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN, Analogies between the Second and Third Isaiah. A Computer Assisted Analysis, in: *Actes du Troisième Colloque International Bible et Informatique*, Paris-Genève 1992, 630-637.

The fourth and fifth round of analysis run parallel to the first and second stage. Again, a comparison of phrases and lexemes is made. This time, the clauses in their *entirety* are not involved in the calculation, but only the *parallel part* of the two clauses. In this way, the balance between the total clause and the parallel part of the clause, involved — or not involved — in the parallelities, can be taken into account.

The sixth and last round of analysis marks the analogies which are bordering on each other. Such a chain of *neighbour-analogies* strengthens the intertextual relationship.

I would like to give an example to illustrate the main aspects of these rounds of analysis, as written out in the scheme below.

	lift up a signal over the peoples					הָרִימוּ נֵס עַל־הָעַמִּים					Isa 62:10g
	and to peoples I will lift up my signal					וְאֶל־עַמִּים אָרִים נִסִּי					Isa 49:22c
				cor.	cor.	cor.	cor.				
		phr.	phr.	pos.	pos.	pos.	pos.	phr.	phr.		
word	lexeme	type	num.	lex.	phr.	phr.	lex.	num.	type	lexeme	word
ו	and ו	CONJP	1	-	-	3	4	1	VP	רום lift up	הָרִימוּ
אֶל	to אֶל		2	-	3	4	5	2	NP	נס signal	נֵס
עַמִּים	people עַם	PP	2	5	3	2	-	3		על over	עַל
אָרִים	lift up רום	VP	3	1	1	2	-			ה the	ה
נִסִּי	signal נס	NP	4	2	2	2	2	3	PP	עַם people	עַמִּים

legend:
cor.pos. = corresponding position
lex. = lexeme
num. = number
phr. = phrase
CONJP = conjunction-phrase
NP = nominal phrase
PP = preposition-phrase
VP = verbal phrase

Isa. 62:10g הָרִימוּ נֵס עַל־הָעַמִּים *lift up a signal over the peoples* consists of three phrases, namely: the verbal phrase הָרִימוּ *lift up*, the nominal phrase נֵס *a signal*, and the preposition-phrase עַל־הָעַמִּים *over the peoples*. Isa. 49:22c וְאֶל־עַמִּים אָרִים נִסִּי *and to peoples I will lift up my signal* consists of four phrases, namely: the conjunction-phrase וְ *and*, the prepositional phrase אֶל־עַמִּים *to peoples*, the verbal phrase אָרִים *I will lift up*, and the nominal phrase נִסִּי *my signal*.

In this analogy, there are corresponding lexemes and corresponding phrases. In the

foregoing figure, I have created a table in which the corresponding lexemes and phrases are written out. On the right is Isa. 62 and on the left is Isa. 49. The first lexeme in Isa. 62:10g, the lexeme רוּם *to lift up*, corresponds with the fourth lexeme in Isa. 49:22c. The second lexeme in Isa. 62:10, the lexeme נֵס *signal*, corresponds with the fifth lexeme in the other text. And, finally, the fifth lexeme in Isa. 62:10, the lexeme עַם *people*, corresponds with the third lexeme in the parallel text of Isa. 49. Although the order of the sequence of the parallel lexemes is different, namely in Isa. 62:10 רוּם — נֵס — עַם, *to lift up — signal — people*, and in Isa. 49:22 עַם — רוּם — נֵס, *people — to lift up — signal*, three pairs of corresponding lexical parallelities are present. Only the lexemes עַל, הַ, וְ, and אֶל have no corresponding lexeme.

In a similar way, the phrases can be described. The first phrase in Isa. 62:10g, i.e. the verbal phrase, corresponds with the third phrase in the parallel clause. The second phrase in Isa. 62:10, the nominal phrase, corresponds with the fourth phrase in the other text. Finally, the two preposition-phrases, the third phrase in the clause of Isa. 62 and the second phrase in the parallel clause of Isa 49 are identical. Only the conjunction-phrase וְ has no parallel.

Although the lexeme רוּם *to lift up* appears in both clauses, the words הָרִימוּ and אָרִים are not identical. These two words have a different tense: in Isa. 62:10 an imperative is used, whereas in Isa. 49:22 an imperfect occurs. The corresponding lexeme נֵס *signal* differs in morphological characteristics as well. In Isa. 49:22 the lexeme נֵס is constructed with the suffix first person singular נִסִּי *my signal*.

On the one hand, identical lexemes may differ as words, on the other hand, different lexemes may occur in identical phrases. In the analogy, formed by Isa. 62:10 and Isa. 49:22, the phrases עַל־הָעַמִּים and אֶל־עַמִּים are identical as phrases. These prepositional phrases, however, have different lexemes: in Isa. 62:10 the lexeme עַל is used, whereas the lexeme אֶל occurs in the text of Isa. 49:22.

Using this method I published a concordance of such analogies for the textblocks Isa 56-66 and Isa. 40-66 with the title *Analogies in Isaiah* in the series *Applicatio*.[6]

2. Analogies versus Search-commands resulting in one-sided information

The criteria in the method I have just expounded, offer a combination of lexicality and morpho-syntax. Therefore, an exclusively lexical approach is precluded. This means that a concordance of analogies differs fundamentally with concordances based on one-sided information. Traditionally, one-sided information consists of

---

[6] A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN, *Analogies in Isaiah*, Volume A: *Computerized Analysis of Parallel Texts between Isaiah 56-66 and Isaiah 40-66* (Applicatio 10A), Volume B: *Computerized Concordance of Analogies between Isaiah 56-66 and Isaiah 40-66* (Applicatio 10B), Amsterdam 1993.

isolated lexical aspects. Theoretically, textual relationships can also be made using different one-sided information. I will give a few examples.[7]

The lemma בְּרִית *covenant* occurs four times in Second Isaiah, namely in 42:6; 49:8; 54:10; and 55:3, and also four times in Third Isaiah, namely in 56:4.6; 59:21 and 61:8. Does this mean that, for instance, Isa. 61:8 must be regarded as a parallel to all four texts from Second Isaiah? In my view, an investigation of further textual data from these verses reaches the conclusion that only Isa 61:8 and 55:3 are parallels and thus form an *analogy*. These verses not only contain the expression בְּרִית עוֹלָם *everlasting covenant*, but moreover they both consist of the (syntactical) construction בָּרַת + בְּרִית + prepositional phrase with ל *to make a covenant with*.

This example makes clear that the single lemma בְּרִית indeed occurs in several places in Isa. 40-66, but that an isolated lemma provides insufficient information to speak of a parallel, in other words to speak of an *analogy* between Second and Third Isaiah.

Another illustrative example is the exegesis of the beginning of Isa. 60. This chapter begins with two imperatives female singular: קוּמִי אוֹרִי *arise, be enlightened*. This observation gives rise to many exegetes to search for parallel texts inside Isa. 40-66 with an imperative female singular. The great many imperatives female singular at the beginning of chapter 47 are often mentioned: ten clauses in total with an imperative female singular. Because chapter 47 is about Babel, some exegetes go so far as to call Isa. 60 the *Gegenstück* (the counterpart) of chapter 47.[8]

A combination of on the one hand, the morphological feature *imperative* and, on the other hand, lexical data makes clear that none of the imperatives in Isa. 47 is formed by either the verb קוּם, or the verb אוּר; that the verbs קוּם and אוּר actually do not occur in chapter 47 at all. The only textplaces in Second Isaiah where the imperative female singular of the verb קוּם occurs, are not in chapter 47, but in Isa. 51:17 and 52:2. In these texts Jerusalem/Sion is addressed. This means that a combined search-act, gives actually those parallel texts of Second Isaiah related to Isa. 60:1 which are subservient to the identification of the addressee in chapter 60.

3. Evaluative concluding remarks

Modern concordances should offer more information than lemma-orientated concordances; especially because a computer has possibilities for more complex search-

---

[7] Confer also: A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN, The Applicatio of a New Kind of Concordance, in: *Actes du Quatrième Colloque International Bible et Informatique*, Paris-Genève 1995, 391-410.

[8] So: F. FELDMANN, *Das Buch Isaias*, Münster 1926, 234.

procedures.[9]
In this article I have tried to make clear that analogies, because of their surplus value of information with regard to, for instance, lemma-orientated concordances, can play a more adequate role in biblical exegesis. This surplus is about the weighed combination of lexicality and morpho-syntax. This weighed combination excludes not only a meaningless analysis of isolated, single lemmata, but also an exegesis built on lemmata which are regarded to be unique. Because uniqueness depends on the size of a text, it is impossible to declare a lemma unique. Therefore, uniqueness cannot play a role in searching for parallelities between texts.[10] In other words: uniqueness is not a syntactical category.

The advantage of using the computer is the consistent manner of searching for and describing textual parallelities. Moreover, the computer offers the possibility of performing, in all their nuances, the criteria I have mentioned and of calculating more complicated comparisons.

In addition, the computer has a greater range. In principle, the computer is able to search for analogies between any two random (Biblical Hebrew) texts.

Nevertheless, I think a critical remark should be made. This remark concerns the semantics. I have not inserted any semantic criteria in the search-procedure. An analogy receives its functional value only in the text which is to be exegeted. A previously defined semantic meaning would detract from this. A *feature-structure* into which semantic aspects for each word are filed, would not only give practical problems — for example the question how to define a word-field —, but, moreover, would change the computer into a form of artificial intelligence, in which the power of formalisms is not decisive any more. In other words: the computer itself will never be an exegete![11]

---

[9] Confer: M. SPERVACK, Concordances: Old and New, *Computer Studies in the Humanities and Verbal Behavior* 4 (1973) 19.

[10] Pace: J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN, *Een begin zonder einde. De doorwerking van Jesaja 65:17 in de intertestamentaire literatuur en het Nieuwe Testament*, Amsterdam 1990, 15. Nevertheless, uniqueness may play a role on a higher interpretation-level, for instance the text-pragmatics.

[11] I wish to thank Maurits J. Sinninghe Damsté (Amsterdam, the Netherlands) for the correction of the English text of this article.